

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 4-7 and 10-15 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 4-7 and 10-15 have been amended. Claims 1 and 7 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. In particular, in the text generation step, the word insertion means uses a learning model to determine whether there is a word to be inserted between any two keywords in all arrangements of the keywords. The specification on page 6, lines 3-10 also discusses this step. Accordingly, all pending claims are now definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-7 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Micher, U.S. Patent No. 7,177,797. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites “an input step for inputting at least a word as a keyword through input means, an extracting step for extracting at least one sentence or sentence fragment including at least the keyword from a database through extracting means, and a text generation step for generating an optimum sentence based on the extracted at least one sentence or sentence fragment by text generation means, wherein parser means morphologically analyzes and parses the extracted at least one sentence or sentence fragment to obtain a dependency structure of the at least one sentence or sentence fragment by determining the probability of dependency of the at least one sentence or sentence fragment by applying a statistical technique using a dependency model, thereby generating a sentence having a maximum probability as the optimum sentence”

Independent claim 7 recites “input means for inputting at least one word as a keyword, extracting means for extracting at least one sentence or sentence fragment including at least the keyword from a database, and text generation means for generating an optimum sentence by using the extracted text, wherein parser means morphologically analyzes and parses the extracted at least one sentence or sentence fragment to obtain a dependency structure of the at least one sentence or sentence fragment by determining the probability of dependency of the at least one sentence or sentence fragment by applying a statistical technique using a dependency model, thereby generating a sentence having a maximum probability as the optimum sentence.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the above combinations of steps and elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 7 are not disclosed nor suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

In the specification, Japanese examples are written using English alphabets. For the illustration purpose, the following examples are explained with English translation and Chinese/Japanese characters.

When “彼女(She)”, “公園 (park)”, and “行った (went)” are input as keywords in an input step, a sentence “彼女 (kanojo) は (wa), 公園 (koen) へ (e) 行った (itta) <She went to a park>”, a sentence fragment “彼女 (kanojo) の (no) 公園 (koen) へ (e) 行った (itta) <... went to her park>”, etc. are extracted in an extracting steps. Subsequently, an optimum sentence “彼女 (kanojo) は (wa), 公園 (koen) へ (e) 行った (itta) <She went to a park>” is generated in a text generation step based on a result of morphological analysis of the extracted sentence and sentence fragment and a dependency structure parsed by the morphological analysis. See page 3, lines 7-19 of the specification.

However, Micher simply teaches a linguistic retrieval system to predict a word. The Examiner in the outstanding Office Action alleged that if the words including the selected word chunk include other words including an additional identifier identifying a next word chunk, the system will display these new word chunks up to what essentially is a second predetermined identifier. Micher in col. 10, lines 12-41 states that, as can be seen by the example shown in FIG. 4a, by inputting a single character “z”, the user can find a word beginning with a word chunk such as “zeit”, “zahn”, “zwei”, and a word such as “ziehen”, “zwischen”, “zarter.” Subsequently, as shown in FIG. 4b, when the user selects the word chunk “zeit”, the displayed character “z” is replaced with the word chunk “zeit”, ending in a tilde. Thereafter, the word prediction continues using the word chunk “zeit”, and the microprocessor searches the database for a word or word chunks beginning with “zeit”.

In other words, Micher merely generates a word such as “ziehen”, “zwischen”, “zarter” and a word chunk such as “zeit”, “zahn”, “zwei” based on an input character “z”, or a word “zeit” to have a related word(s). Micher nowhere discloses extracting a sentence or a sentence fragment including at least the keyword, and nowhere discloses generating a sentence. Therefore, Micher fails to teach “an extracting step for extracting at least one sentence or sentence fragment including at least the keyword from a database through extracting means, and a text generation step for generating an optimum sentence based on the extracted at least one sentence or sentence fragment by text generation means” as recited in claim 1, and “extracting means for extracting at least one sentence or sentence fragment including at least the keyword from a database, and text generation means for generating an optimum sentence by using the extracted text” as recited in claim 7.

In addition, since there is no sentence/sentence fragment is generated in Micher, no morphological analysis will be performed on the sentence/sentence fragment in Micher. Therefore, Micher also fails to teach “parser means morphologically analyzes and parses the extracted at least one sentence or sentence fragment to obtain a dependency structure of the at least one sentence or sentence fragment by determining the probability of dependency of the at least one sentence or sentence fragment by applying a statistical technique using a dependency model, thereby generating a sentence having a maximum probability as the optimum sentence” as recited in claims 1 and 7

Since Micher fails to teach each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 7, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 7 and their dependent claims clearly define over

Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2007

the teachings of Micher. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, Registration No. 61,007 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated:

APR 16 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant